



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,154	11/22/2000	George Friedman	1237-00	8839

35811 7590 10/30/2003

IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP
3400 TWO LOGAN SQUARE
18TH AND ARCH STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

SONG, HOSUK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,154

Applicant(s)

FRIEDMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Hosuk Song

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-4,6-17,19,21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burns et al.(US 5,931,947).

Claim 1: Burn's patent discloses detecting a file system request in (col.4,lines 29-35). Burn disclose completing the file system request in (col.6,lines 40-43). Burns disclose receiving return information from the file system request in (col.11,lines 1-25). Burns disclose determining whether the file system request is for a tag file associated with a secured file and if so, modifying return information to reflect a file attribute of the secured file in (col.11,lines 49-57 and col.12,lines 62-67;col.13,lines 1-27).

Claim 2: Burns disclose file attribute is file size in (col.12,lines 48-50).

Claim 3: Burns disclose determining whether return information identifies a plurality of tag files associated with a plurality of secured files and if so, modifying the return information to reflect a file attribute of the plurality of secured files in (col.7,lines 39-55).

Claim 4: Burns disclose secured file is stored in encrypted form in (col.7,lines 39-48).

Claim 6: Burns disclose secured file is stored on a remote networked device in (col.5,lines 30-33 and fig.1).

Claim 7: Burns disclose file system request is to open a file in (col.11,lines 65-67;col.12,lines 1-7).

Claim 8: Burns disclose file system request is to delete a file in (col.11,lines 28-30).

Claim 9: Burns disclose file system request is to rename a file in (col.11,lines 65-67;col.12,lines 1-7).

Claim 10: Burns disclose file system is to query file information (col.6,lines 27-33).

Claim 11: Burns disclose file system request is to set file information in (col.10,lines 63-65).

Claims 12,13: Burns disclose file system request is to find a first matching file in (col.12,lines 61-67).

Claim 14: Burns disclose file system request is directory control in (col.12,lines 20-35).

Claim 15: Burns' patent discloses detecting a file system request in (col.4,lines 29-35). Burns disclose completing the file system request in (col.6,lines 40-43). Burns disclose receiving return information from the file system request in (col.11,lines 1-25). Burns disclose determining whether the file system request is for a tag file associated with a secured file and if so, modifying return information to reflect a file attribute of the secured file in (col.11,lines 49-57 and col.12,lines 62-67;col.13,lines 1-27).

Claim 16: Burns disclose file attribute is file size in (col.12,lines 48-50).

Claim 17: Burns disclose determining whether return information identifies a plurality of tag files associated with a plurality of secured files and if so, modifying the return information to reflect a file attribute of the plurality of secured files in (col.7,lines 39-55).

Claim 19: Burns disclose secured file is stored in encrypted form in (col.7,lines 39-48).

Claim 21: Burns disclose secured file is stored on a remote networked device in (col.5,lines 30-33 and fig.1).

Claim 22: Burns disclose file system request is to open a file in (col.11,lines 65-67;col.12,lines 1-7).

Claim 23: Burns disclose file system request is to delete a file in (col.11,lines 28-30).

Claim 24: Burns disclose file system request is to rename a file in (col.11,lines 65-67;col.12,lines 1-7).

Claim 25: Burns disclose file system is to query file information (col.6,lines 27-33).

Claim 26: Burns disclose file system request is to set file information in (col.10,lines 63-65).

Claims 27,28: Burns disclose file system request is to find a first matching file in (col.12,lines 61-67).

Claim 29: Burns disclose file system request is directory control in (col.12,lines 20-35).

Claims 30,31: Burns patent disclose all the limitation. It is inherent in system of Burns to include a computer implemented instruction/algorithm to carry out data processing method such as detecting file system request and completing file system request between two systems.

Claims 32: Burns' patent disclose detecting a file system request in (col.4,lines 29-35) Burn disclose completing the file system request in (col.6,lines 40-43). Burns disclose receiving return information from the file system request in (col.11,lines 1-25). Burns disclose determining whether the file system request is for a tag file associated with a secured file and if so, modifying return information to reflect a file attribute of the secured file in (col.11,lines 49-57 and col.12,lines 62-67;col.13,lines 1-27).

Claim 33: Burns disclose file attribute is file size in (col.12,lines 48-50).

Claim 34: Burns disclose determining whether return information identifies a plurality of tag files associated with a plurality of secured files and if so, modifying the return information to reflect a file attribute of the plurality of secured files in (col.7,lines 39-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 5,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al.(US 5,931,947) in view of Johnson et al.(US 4,887,204).

Claims 5,20: Burns patent does not specifically disclose secured file is stored in a secure virtual file system. Johnson discloses secured file is stored in a secure virtual file system in (col.13,lines 18-28). It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to store secure files in a secure virtual file system as taught in Johnson with file accessing system disclosed in Burns in order to provide a uniform file oriented,multiple file system environment for both local and remote files. Further, secure virtual file system provide orderly mapping of stored information which allows user for easy access with security.

3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al.(US 5,931,947) in view of Roberts(US 5,287,453).

Claim 18: Burns disclose all the limitations above. Burns does not specifically disclose file system monitor. Roberts patent disclose file system monitor in (col.5,lines 55-68;col.6,lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to employ a file system monitor disclosed in Roberts with a network storage system taught in Burns in order to monitor file activity and automated file processing like real time directory synchronizations. File system monitor allows files synchronization between servers,files that waste space on file servers(pollution files,temporary files,games etc) where the system manages disk storage space by deleting unwanted files thus providing efficient way of managing data storage and data activity.

Conclusion


4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Xu et al.(6,324,581) discloses remote data control by the users.
 - b. Ault et al.(US 5,689,701) discloses file system request to control the data.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hosuk Song whose telephone number is 703-305-0042. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fri from 6:00 am —4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


HS


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100